ERIC Document Resume	See Instruction Sheet	DATE OF RESUME 7/12/65	DATE RECEIVED

1. PUBLICATION DATA

1. ERIC NUMBER	2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S).	3. IDENTIFICATION NO.	DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW
D000295	7027	N.A.	

4. AUTHOR(S):
Smith, George B.

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED:
Who Would Be Eliminated?

6. PUBLICATION TITLE:
The Coming Crisis in the Selection of Students for College Entrance

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT GRANTED YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED YES ☒ NO ☐

TYPE OF REPORT
PROPOSAL ☐
IN-PROGRESS ☐
FINAL ☒
FOLLOW-UP ☐

7. EDITOR(S):
Anderson, Kenneth E. ed.

8. PLACE OF ORIGIN
ORG. Univ. of Kansas
ST. Lawrence, Kansas
CITY, STATE
TELE. EXT.
INST/LOC CODE

9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE
National Education Association
Washington, D.C.

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

10. VOL.	11. PAGES	12. MO./YR.	13. TOTAL PP.
N.A.	29-37	60	9

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

14. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA

15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR
report

16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)

aptitude R-13	measurement O-12	placements P-14		
achievement R-04	admissions R-07	evaluation G-19		
students Y-15	counseling R-37			

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

Discusses selection experience at the University of Kansas and summarizes results of a study of aptitude and achievement tests taken at matriculation by students of the University of Kansas who graduated in the years 1955 through 1959. Attention is called to the significant number receiving degrees who would have been denied a college education by the application of selective admission techniques. Suggests that tests be used for placement and guidance, and not as admission criteria.

IC No.

18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION	20. DIVISION OR DEPT.	21. CONTRACT NO. / PROJECT NO.
	22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT	
	23. DURATION OF PROJECT	U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Office of Education

IC Form 1

PRECEDING PAGES MISSING

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

The Coming Crises in the Selection of Students for College Entrance
National Education Association
Wash, D.C.
1960

Who Would Be Eliminated?

GEORGE B. SMITH
Dean of the University
The University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas

I cannot launch this paper without proper bows to my colleagues. I, too, was trained in the Minnesota and Iowa traditions of educational tests, measurements and statistics. I, too, share their enthusiasm for a test well-constructed, well-administered and well-taken, and for test results intelligently used. I, too, am a worshiper at the shrine of better, more reliable and more valid tests in all fields. I wish no debate or argument with any of my friends here or elsewhere nor conflict on the field of testing honor, for I am shoulder to shoulder with them all in the reconnaissance troops that are searching and probing for slight gains and hoping for major breakthroughs in this important field of educational endeavor.

However, I fervently hope that we in the United States will reserve our testing programs, as we know them now, for purposes of placement and guidance, postponing as far as possible the day when we use them for selective admission to our colleges and universities.

It is obvious that programs for the selection of students *must* be developed in certain institutions of higher learning where the enrollment is necessarily limited by inadequate facilities or dictated by official quotas. Any private college or university, where governing boards and faculties decide for reasons financial or educational that limits must be imposed on the incoming classes, must, of course, develop a system of admission requirements. Usually these include, as I believe they should, as one element in their procedure, a more or less extensive testing program of the type described in the previous papers. Enrollments must also be limited in the academies of the Armed Services where quotas are established by law, and also in certain divisions of state universities, such as Schools of Medicine, where laboratory facilities, instructional techniques and off-campus accrediting standards automatically limit the number of students to be admitted.

We have faced such selection before in many other areas of education. In an earlier movement for the separation of students into "homogeneous groups," for instance, we discovered the inevitable "heterogeneity" of the "homogeneous" group. A broad range of ability existed even when single factors were considered, but it became overwhelming whenever two or three additional factors were introduced.

Perhaps our most practical experience with selection has come from the effort to choose scholarship students in our colleges and universities.

At the University of Kansas, for instance, we have experimented since 1929 with the selection procedures used in our Summerfield Scholarship Program. For over thirty years, carefully selected high school senior boys, nominated by their high school principals on the basis of excellence in scholarship and probable success in university work, have taken an extensive preliminary examination battery in university-staffed testing centers throughout the state. The top performers have then proceeded to the University of Kansas campus in Lawrence for still more specialized testing and for personal interviews with faculty members in numerous academic disciplines. Finally, broadly representative and dedicated committee members make a yearly selection of from twelve to twenty young men for Summerfield Scholarship awards, all of which carry high academic and personal

ED000 295

prestige on our campus and throughout the state. In all probability this selection program ranks among the best in the United States.

Yet, even in this program, in which *every* safeguard has been established, each year the selection committee members marvel at the fact that some of those selected fail to perform adequately in the academic programs they enter, and that many of those not selected for the Summerfield Scholarships far outstrip the level of performance predicted by the committee of experts. Whenever a line is drawn, as it must be in some situations, and even when the choice is from a highly selected group to start with, many errors occur.

Further evidence comes from a study of "The Variability in Academic Achievement of Exceptional High School and College Students,"[1] done in 1957 by Dr. Kenneth E. Anderson, President of the American Educational Research Association. His results indicate great overlapping in grades received in college by those students falling in the upper ten per cent and those in the lowest ten per cent in such college placement examinations as the American Council on Education Psychological Examination.

The percentage of errors, I am sure, will increase as the group from which the selection is to be made, decreases in selectivity. When one chooses by drawing a line at the "lower third in high school class" or on examinations, I believe that those who are rejected, certainly those within gun-shot south of the "cutting score," would, on the average, do equally well in academic life as those within gun-shot north of the line. It should also be remembered that in large institutions, as huge influxes of students make a testing program necessary, these same large numbers also reduce the possibility of using careful individual interviews and other supplemental techniques. Popular articles on "selection by examinations" in magazines and news releases seldom give any hint of the need for such supplemental techniques. The general public, unaware of the fallibility of tests and the need for additional devices if we are even to approximate valid selection, is often misled by such publicity and expects the impossible from these suggested programs. Perhaps it is fair to predict that the general public, having acquired a false sense of security from releases on testing programs, may be on the verge of a popular "binge" in the direction of controls for entrance to college matched only by the one induced by SPUTNIK I.

If, because of the large numbers of persons to be screened, we rely on test results alone for selection, we would do well to remember the experience of the College Entrance Examination Board, where very careful testing and significant additional evidence is used. Dr. Frank H. Boles, president of the College Entrance Examination Board, in an address entitled, "Candidates and Confusion," said a few years ago:

> We also need better measures and better procedures, and, as well, a better understanding of the use of measures and procedures. The use of tests to support arbitrary admissions restrictions is deplorable. Tests are only substitutes for judgment, not judgment, and counsellors and admissions officers must curb their instinct to accept this substitute when time presses.[2]

The great state universities of this country have worked assiduously toward the present diversity of offerings which provide for students of widely different

---

[1] Kenneth E. Anderson. "A Study of the Variability in Achievement of Exceptional High School and College Students." *University of Kansas Bulletin of Education*, 12 (November, 1957) 15-24.

[2] Frank H. Boles. "Candidates and Confusion." *College and University*, 32 (Summer, 1957).

talents, preparing them to make significantly different contributions to the life of the nation. The wisdom of the faculties in these institutions and the pressures of public opinion have, over the past fifty to one hundred years, expanded the offerings and divisions of the universities until now, truly representative of their "publics," they have the most heterogeneous group of courses, faculties and students imaginable. Nor is it likely that the situation will or should change, for if the GI enrollments following World War II are any indication of the future concentrations of students, it is in these institutions that the great influx in the next decades will center. Unwise use of narrow selective procedures could, therefore, undermine the very program which these institutions were established to provide.

The students in these colleges are headed for agricultural, scientific or business pursuits; for forestry, law, medicine, pharmacy, dentistry or engineering; and for teaching and social work. Some of them are pursuing cultural interests in languages, literature, history, philosophy, art or music, all of which have particular significance for the society of the future. Such heterogeneity of course offerings and departmental objectives is one of the hallmarks of the large university. In such a situation, continual adjustment in varieties of program is the rule, not the exception. To restrict college entrance for these students of widely varied talents on the basis of a narrow battery of tests, unsupported by personal interviews or additional relevant data, would seem to be little short of immoral. Abilities vary among candidates for all of these programs. It would be interesting, for example, to speculate on how one could alter the complexion of the entering class by including tests of art and music as substitutes for mathematics or science sections of certain batteries of examinations.

Still another complicating factor, often deplored by opponents of this system, is the fact that admission to the state university depends, in many instances, merely upon graduation from a state-accredited secondary school over which the institutions of higher learning have no jurisdiction and with which they have little communication unless they establish informal relations with it.

But is the situation as deplorable as it is often pictured? Irresponsible remarks and press releases, sometimes by leaders in higher education themselves, frequently prejudice the public against what is, in reality, the greatest asset in our educational system. Such listeners and readers attend only to what they want to hear or know. They ask no evidence, and they often misinterpret what facts they have. Armed with half-truths they press, for example, for selective admission in order to "keep out the four year loafers," and "those who could not possibly profit from college." This, they assume, is all in the interest of "saving the taxpayers' money." I personally believe that less is known, by the general public, about the constituency of our college populations than about anything else in higher education. And, parenthetically, I'm sure that we in higher education have, for many known reasons and some unknown, failed to inform the public regarding our programs and pattern of courses. Not only is the public poorly informed but our own colleagues in our higher educational institutions are equally ignorant concerning the caliber of our student bodies and the effect of probation policies and general attrition upon our student bodies.

In this day and age of steadily increasing "probation regulations" and "standards" in the colleges and universities themselves, plus the pyramiding pressures

from economic and personal sources, it is a rare "loafer" who survives the second semester cut. In the very few who manage to make it through the second year I would suspect innate ability which could carry them on to a college degree with little additional guidance or direction.[3,4]

Our own studies at The University of Kansas indicate that approximately forty per cent of the entering freshmen do not attain junior standing. In short, the "universality" of college and university education seems to be subject to Darwin's theory of the "survival of the fittest." It could be contended that this is a far more democratically arrived at end-product of elimination than a system of entrance examinations would ensure. And, although this is another topic and an area of hot disagreement, it might be contended that perhaps as important a job is being done for those who stay a short time and then drop out as is being done for those who stay on to graduate.

In the interest of better understanding both among ourselves and in our relations with the public, may I present certain evidence from my own institution, The University of Kansas, with respect to aspects of the program which concern us all?

The University of Kansas is one of those state universities which, by state law, admits students with diplomas from state-accredited secondary schools without restrictive examinations. "In this situation," you may say both to yourself and to the public, "selective examinations would really strike a blow for academic excellence." Yet 27.8 per cent of the incoming freshmen class of 1959 were in the upper ten per cent of their high school graduating classes, 17.5 per cent were in the second ten per cent and 79.5 per cent were in the upper half of their classes.

It is, of course, immediately acknowledged that many institutions will vary from this pattern, particularly those in large cities where it is easy, logistically, to go on to college. It should be remembered, however, that with better high school guidance programs and with increasing "standards" in the colleges and universities, it is fairly safe to assume that high school students in the lower half of their graduating classes will question even more than in the past the wisdom of attempting to go on to the traditional academic institution of higher learning. This movement will be undergirded by the expansion and establishment of other types of institutions, to quote the *President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School*.[5]

Two notable educational leaders stress this point. First, President James B. Conant, in his *Education in a Divided World*, says:

> . . . really effective counselling is the keystone of the arch of a widespread educational system dedicated to the principle of equality of opportunity. A democracy, unlike a totalitarian state, cannot force its youth into what the authorities consider the appropriate groove of advanced education. In this republic of free men, no official can decree what line of study must be pursued. How is the sorting process to be accomplished? The answer is by the democratic method of enlightenment and persuasion.[6]

---

[3] Robert E. Iffert. "Retention and Withdrawal of College Students." United States Office of Education, *Bulletin*, 1958, No. 1.

[4] Robert E. Iffert. "Dropouts: Nature and Causes: Effect on Student, Family and Society." *Current Issues in Higher Education*, 1956, pp. 94-99.

[5] Report of *President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School*. Washington: G.P.O. 1957.

[6] James B. Conant. *Education In a Divided World*. Harvard University Press, 1958.

And secondly, in the *Educational Record* in January, 1959, President Virgil M. Hancher of the State University of Iowa, writes:

> Knowing that motivation is a powerful force in the learning process, guidance and counselling should be utilized to enable a student to appraise himself and his abilities and to make wise choices of his curriculum and his career. But neither guidance nor admissions systems are infallible, and the best system is to allow all well-motivated and reasonably intelligent youth an opportunity to succeed. What would our modern guidance and admissions systems have had to say of Churchill, Darwin, Newton, Einstein and other stubborn non-conformists? *The proof of ability is in the trial of it*—and there is less rebellion and frustration, bitter though they may be, toward the attempt that fails than there is toward the social order which denies the individual's right even to make the attempt.[7]

A second problem to be faced is the effect of size of high school on scores on selective admission examinations. This has been discussed in several papers.[8,9] In a state such as Kansas, where extremes are common, the median-size high school is about 70 pupils. The general educational experience in science alone in a small rural high school of 35 to 40 students with three to five teachers semi-trained in several areas and perhaps without teaching experience in any, is meager indeed when compared with that in a first class city high school with excellent laboratories (which would put some of our college facilities to shame) and with professional teachers holding at least master's degrees in a single area of science teaching, such as physics, and teaching only in the major field where they have been teaching for many years. The effect of this difference upon results in a typical admissions test needs no documentation.

In passing it might be noted that even rank in high school class, mentioned frequently as a basis for selective admission, may be questioned in this same framework. Someone coming from the top of a graduating class of four or five students from a high school where only one graduate in five or six years goes on to college and where there has been no advanced mathematics, foreign language, laboratory science or fourth year English, may be a less logical choice for college when measured by selective admissions examinations than someone from the lower half of a large suburban high school near Kansas City, in which 75 per cent of its large graduating classes have traditionally gone on to college. At the same time, the student from the small rural high school may have infinitely greater potentialities for final success in college.

In the third place, we are faced with the question, what is the best predictor of college success? R. M. W. Travers, on the basis of research done at the University of Michigan, supplemented by additional evidence by P. F. Munger[10] and others, believes that:

> We must have a measure of the student's actual work in college in order to say that he is college material. Even after we have said he is college

---

[7] Virgil M. Hancher. "The Challenge We Face." *Educational Record*, January, 1959, pp. 11-19.

[8] I. R. Bow and F. L. Stovall. "A Study of High School Academic Indices as a Criterion for College Admission." *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 41 (May, 1950) 305-320.

[9] Dale Scannell. *Differential Prediction of Academic Success from Achievement Test Scores*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, State University of Iowa, 1958.

[10] Paul F. Munger. "Can We Really Predict Who Will Graduate From College?" *College and University*, Vol. XXXII, No. 2, Winter, 1956.

> material we cannot be sure that he will graduate. . . . we are not justified in pointing to one of the majority of high school graduates and saying that he is definitely *not* college material. We are perhaps better able to state who *is* college material than who is *not*.[11]

In the fourth place, many studies have been made of the effect of various types of racial and cultural backgrounds upon test results. While most of these studies, such as those by Ginsberg, Wolfle, Plaut,[12] Clark and Harrison, McClelland,[13] Bond[14] and Bray[15] have emphasized the unfairness of results so far as the negro is concerned, there are implications for other minority groups as well. All who have studied in this area are cautious in their statements about the use of tests for minority groups. R. L. Plaut, in *Blueprint for Talent Searching,* maintains that: "There is strong evidence from the follow-up study of college records of these students that those from culturally deprived groups are likely to do better in college than their aptitude tests predict."[16]

In general, two arguments are put forward by proponents of selective admission to our colleges and universities. One is the desirability of homogeneous groups at the college level and the other is lack of space. Cost, of course, enters into both of these. None of my colleagues here today, to the best of my knowledge, has ever proposed selective admission for the purpose of developing an educated elite at the expense of producing an educated citizenry as a whole. The desirability of giving all citizens who can profit from it the opportunity to attend some state-supported institution for education beyond high school is accepted by most educators, including the group of national leaders who served on the *President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School.*[17]

No extensive support seems necessary in this paper on behalf of the point of view expressed by President de Kiewiet of the University of Rochester and completely accepted by most of us that: ". . . the true greatness of American education is held aloft by the two pillars of *quality* and *quantity*. We can do ourselves immense harm by not continuing this dual mandate."[18]

So far as cost is concerned, to assume that selection for many of our large state universities would lower the tax burden is wishful thinking. If "other facilities" such as junior colleges and technical institutes are made available to those not admitted to the large institutions, it is my sincere judgment that cost will not be reduced; in all probability it will be increased.

Additional research is needed in all of the areas so far presented before the case for selective admission can be established.

---

[11] R. M. W. Travers. "Significant Research on the Prediction of Academic Success." In W. I. Donahue, C. H. Coombs and R. M. W. Travers, *The Measurement of Student Adjustment and Achievement.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1949.

[12] Richard L. Plaut. *Blueprint for Talent Searching.* New York: National Scholarship Service and Fund for Negro Students, 1957.

[13] David C. McClelland, et al. *Talent and Society.* New York: D. Van Nostrand Company, 1958.

[14] Horace Bond. "Talent and Toilets." *The Journal of Negro Education,* Vol. 28, pp. 3-14.

[15] Douglas W. Bray. *"Issues in the Study of Talent."* New York: King's Crown Press, Columbia University, 1954.

[16] Plaut. *op. cit.*

[17] *President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School. op. cit.*

[18] C. W. de Kiewiet. Remarks noted in R. K. Snyder. "Admissions Procedures: Effective Means of Selection." *Current Issues in Higher Education,* 1956.

It should be emphasized, however, that a weakness in most studies of the type concerning students lies in the fact that group measurements are used to draw conclusions for individual cases. Justice cannot be done to individual students on the basis of group predictions. The overlapping of groups in selective admissions, as in every other area in the study of human differences and abilities, makes the application of results to individual cases precarious at best.

So far it has been pointed out that selection by examination for admission to college still needs serious study and that the public should be warned of the many difficulties involved lest they blandly assume that selective admission may be the road to lower taxes or, worse still, to the achievement of the purposes for which American state universities were established. They would understand also, that selection is as yet an unsolved problem. May I, in this connection, present a study in which I have been engaged for some years at the University of Kansas?[19]

This study was made of the graduating class of 1955 to see how many students who received degrees at that commencement were in the lower half of the distribution on both the American Council on Education Psychological Examination and a Speed of Reading Examination when they took the placement examinations upon entrance to the University as freshmen.

These two tests were selected for this study because they were used in the placement examination battery during the five years of the expanded study. In addition, until recently, an all-round academic ability examination and a speed of reading examination have appeared in most standard selection testing programs. Many of our colleagues and the general public, I feel sure, assume such tests will be included in selection batteries for years to come. It is quite likely that other tests of a similar nature or other types of tests would present patterns slightly varied from the one which follows but some starting point had to be established in order to present a picture which would at least raise questions in the minds of the public and some of our colleagues. It is my fear that most people are placidly accepting selection testing as a panacea for all, or almost all, of our educational problems.

Two hundred and eight out of one thousand and six graduating seniors in June 1955 were found to be in this lower group. They represented almost every academic discipline and every college or school in the University.

In passing, it may be mentioned that the School of Fine Arts, of all the divisions, had the highest proportion of graduates (35 per cent) in this lower half while the School of Medicine (11 per cent) and the School of Engineering (16 per cent) had the lowest. As was said before, it would be interesting to speculate as to where these students would have stood if test questions in art and music had been substituted for mathematics and science sections of certain of the batteries.

The study of the class of 1955 has been repeated for the classes of 1958 and 1959, and interpolations have been developed for the classes of 1956 and 1957. The results for 1955, 1958 and 1959 were so similar that it did not seem justifiable to spend time developing the actual data for the two missing years.

The summary paragraph for the five-year period, 1955 through 1959, can now be written as follows:

---

[19] George B. Smith. "Who Would Be Eliminated? A Study of Selective Admission to College." *Kansas Studies in Education*, University of Kansas. Vol. 7, No. 1, December, 1956 (Reprint and Addendum, 1958).

> If restrictions for admission had eliminated all those who scored below the fiftieth percentile of both the A.C.E. and the Speed of Reading Examinations, and provided, of course, that these students had not gone elsewhere to school, the loss to the state and to the nation would have been over 1100 individuals in only five graduating classes.
>
> With estimates included for the graduating classes of 1956 and 1957, the loss to the state and the nation would have been 202 teachers, 176 engineers, 22 journalists, 31 lawyers, 25 medical doctors, 43 pharmacists and 482 graduates of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and the School of Business who majored in areas where the supply of trained manpower is in equally short supply.

Parenthetically, it might be of interest to know that in each graduating class the picture of academic success of those students "who would have been eliminated" paralleled the picture of the 1955 group of 208 where one received senior honors, two were on the Dean's Academic Honor List for six semesters, one for five, one for four, three for three, ten for two and twenty-nine for one. This is a total of forty-six out of 208 students who appeared on their Dean's Academic Honor List one or more semesters during their academic careers. One was elected to Tau Beta Pi, two to Sigma Tau, one to Sachem, our senior honor society for men, one to Mortar Board, and one to Phi Beta Kappa. There were many and varied posts of leadership held by individuals in this group.

To underscore a previous point it might be well to mention that the man elected to Phi Beta Kappa was a Negro and a graduate of as nearly segregated a secondary school as we have in Kansas. He is now in his second year as a Woodrow Wilson Graduate Scholar at one of the distinguished graduate schools in the Ivy League.

The writer can think of no better way to emphasize points he has made than by quoting from an article written by Claude Eggertsen in February of 1958:

> But there is no question that we Americans have ample resources, if they are properly allocated, to achieve the dream of universal education. . . .
>
> Just as we have built a high school to enroll virtually all adolescents, so are we now creating, out of the same traditions and with full appreciation of the demands of the shrinking world, the standard of a college education for a greatly increased number of young adults. . . .
>
> An objection to the proposal that students of varying abilities be allowed to enter college just because they wish to do so is that some incompetents will gain entrance and contribute to lowering of standards. One of the many answers to this view is that the entrance examination system also allows some to enter who are bad college risks. Another response is that even if the examination results are valid, the line which must be drawn between those who are selected and those who are rejected is an arbitrary one. To decide that the twentieth person in a hundred will be accepted and that the twenty-first will not, may do grave injustice to individuals and the social order. Why not draw the line at the fifteenth or at the tenth? Does such a line mean anything more than that a society has decided that the advantages to be derived from higher education are only great enough to warrant the expenditure needed to educate 10 to 20 per cent? It is hoped that influential Americans will recognize that the claim

that significant differences in ability demand rigorous selection is only a rationalization for the fact that society feels it is not worthwhile to sacrifice heavily enough to pay for the higher education of a larger proportion of its young adults.

These are the essential elements in the story of how in not much more than half a century Americans have been led toward the conclusion that by far the most significant factor in the selection of college students is the wish of the individual. If mistakes are to be made, as they will be under any system of selection, is it not wiser to risk error in the direction of confidence in the student's good faith and toward a belief in the power of self-direction and motivation rather than place too great faith in the ability of adults to predict successful performance in existing college programs? The student must be informed and counselled, of course, but it is he who should make the final decision on the basis of his own perception of the task to be performed and of his own abilities.[20]

So did Eggertsen end his article. And so will I end this paper, with the firm belief that great values are to be obtained through the intelligent use of placement examinations and related guidance services in all units of our school system, with the conviction no one has yet developed a test to measure personal drive, stick-to-itiveness, and other significant qualities without which high test scores may be meaningless and with an overabundance of which low test scores become equally misleading.

We should fervently hope that we can educate the general public, and many of our colleagues, to feel that the coming enrollment crush is not a curse but in all probabiilty is the greatest single blessing that could befall this or any other country. From it will come expanded leadership, advanced thinking and innumerable contributions to the well-being of the nation and, we hope, the world. In addition there should come larger numbers of intelligent followers to support American leadership in facing the challenge to come in the latter half of the twentieth century and in the early years of the twenty-first.

The solution for the crush of future enrollments is not selection prior to registration in a state system, college or university, if such institutions can in any way possible expand their facilities to accept all individuals wishing to be educated. It would seem, from my study of the situation, that every other device for handling large enrollments should be tried before screening entrants by examinations. And if selective admission must come, as I sincerely hope it will not, it must be pointed out that elimination of the students not chosen is never a part of the plan but that other institutions or types of institutions are to be developed for the education beyond high school of those for whom there is no room in our present programs. I believe that there are movements afoot made up of individuals who at best can be described as "uninformed" and who do not understand that the second part of the selection program calls for new or expanded facilities and programs for those students not selected for our existing institutions. I believe that we in the educational fields have not stressed this alternative in our enthusiasm for selection techniques.

There are still more question marks than exclamation points in the selective admission field.

---

[20] Claude Eggertsen. "Shall It Be College for Everybody?" *School of Education Bulletin*, The University of Michigan, Vol. 29, No. 5, 1958.